

80



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,708	04/30/2001	James R.H. Challenger	Y0R9-2001-0281US1 (8728-5)	2686
46069	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,708

Applicant(s)

CHALLENGER ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-24 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-24 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 10/21/2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 13-15, and 25-27 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-14, 16-24, and 28-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 16, and 28 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1, 3-8, 13-15, and 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky et al, hereinafter Troyansky (US Pub.# 2003/0190054 A1, 10/9/2003, Provisional application filed on 10/3/2000), in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Creating Commercial Web Pages", hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.110-115), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejection of claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Using Netscape, The User-Friendly Reference", Ernst, W., hereinafter Netscape, QUE, 1995, pp.324-327, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

5. The rejection of claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Davis et al, hereinafter Davis (US PUB.#

Art Unit: 2178

20040037449, 2/26/2004, Provisional filed on 2/4/2000), has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

6. The rejections of claims 10-12, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Adobe PageMill 2.0 Handbook", Lewis, R., hereinafter Pagemill, Hayden Books, 1996, pp.138-143, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

7. The rejections of claims 16-20, and 22-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong (Pat.# 6,151,609, 11/21/2000), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

8. The rejection of claim 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Pagemill, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

9. The rejections of claim 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Minematsu (Pat.# 6,700,993, 3/2/2004, filed on 9/6/2000), has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

10. The information disclosure statement filed 10/21/2004 has been considered.

Drawings

11. The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. Claims 25-27 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1, 3-8, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky et al, hereinafter Troyansky (US Pub.# 2003/0190054 A1, 10/9/2003, Provisional application filed on 10/3/2000), in view of Takashi et al, hereinafter Takashi (US Pub. # 2002/0059162, 5/16/2002, filed on 2/8/1999), and further in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Creating Commercial Web Pages", hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.110-115).

Regarding independent claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--

Art Unit: 2178

watermarks--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files, which are in a textual format-- *a static textual portion of the HTML document* (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), are obtained, and then watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image--*media file*. Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a server request for the HTML document; providing to the client a media file*. However, Takashi teaches clients accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a server (0020, 0005, 0024, 2nd parag.). In other words, the web page is transmitted or sent to the requesting client. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, and Takashi and place the image or media file into an HTML page using an "" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use over the Internet.

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML document that references textual content*. However, Lemay teaches inserting an image into a web page, such as an album cover, using an "abbacov.gif..." tag--*a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML document that references textual content*-- which references an image of the album cover using the title of the image (page 111, lines 21-32, page 112, lines 15-22, and fig. 6.5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, and Lemay and place the image or media file into an HTML page using an "" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), are obtained, and then watermarked by converting --converting at the server the textual content referenced by the dynamic assembly image tag-- those HTML parts into an image--media file.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--watermarks--such as image (0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files are watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *an expression of an idea within the textual content is the property of an entity*. However, Lemay teaches inserting an image into a web page, such as an album title—"ABBA: You Can Dance, You Can Cry"--, using an "<H1>" tag -- HTML entity (page 112, line 22, and fig. 6.5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, and Lemay and place the album title into an HTML page using an "<H1>" tag, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files are watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image. The watermarks are used to enforce rights to digital media to be distributed to an authorized party (0002-0003). In other words the parts of the HTML files are watermarked by converting those HTML parts into an image--*media file*.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches compressing a watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*compression preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches compressing a watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*file format* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding independent claim 13, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content --*determining a content creation preference*--by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files--*electronically encoded document*-- with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files are extracted, and then watermarked by converting those HTML parts, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), into an image--*media file*.

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *obtaining the electronically encoded document*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to obtain the HTML file, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Furthermore, Troyansky teaches distributing digital content, such as the watermarked HTML files, to an authorized user—*content in image format to client* (0003).

Claims 28-30 are directed towards program instructions stored on a program storage device for executing the steps found in claims 1, 3, and 5 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

15. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, and further in view of Lemay, and further in view of “Using Netscape, The User-Friendly Reference”, Ernst, W., hereinafter Netscape, QUE, 1995, pp.324-327.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the media file is stored in one of a client-side database and a networked cache*. However, Netscape teaches the temporarily storing previously viewed web pages, in a browser’s computer (page 325, lines 17-page326, line 14). It would have been

Art Unit: 2178

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Lemay, and Netscape, because Netscape teaches above storing previously viewed web pages locally in the computer's temporary directory or cache. Thus, providing the benefit of quickly accessing the web pages, which also contain images.

16. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, further in view of Lemay, and further in view of Davis et al, hereinafter Davis (US PUB.# 20040037449, 2/26/2004, Provisional filed on 2/4/2000).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the media file is sound file*. However, Davis teaches embedding audio, such as synthesized text, watermarks into media signals (0041). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Troyansky, Lemay, and Davis, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting watermarked information into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use using hidden audio files.

17. Claims 10-12, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, and further in view of Lemay, and further in view of "Adobe PageMill 2.0 Handbook", Lewis, R., hereinafter Pagemill, Hayden Books, 1996, pp.138-143.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *generating an image map corresponding to the image file, according to a mapping preference stored on the server*. However, Takashi teaches clients accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a server (0020, 0005, 0024, 2nd parag.) Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL, using a “USEMAP” attribute—*mapping preference--*, into a web page (page 139, page 141, lines 24-34, and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the mapping preference relates selectable spatial display coordinates to external document identifiers in order to enable user navigation*. However, Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs. When a user clicks on an area, the browser jumps to the URL—*external document identifier--* of the respective area (page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2178

the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 3, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *converting the textual content to a media file eliminates the use of scripting commands for presenting the textual content*. However, Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs (page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). This means, that the necessity of the need for using scripting commands to present textual content, since images are being used. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Lemay, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

Claim 31 is directed towards program instructions stored on a program storage device for executing the steps found in claim 10, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

18. Claims 16-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong (Pat.# 6,151,609, 11/21/2000).

Regarding independent claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content --*determining a content creation preference*--by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files--*electronically encoded HTML document*-- with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files are extracted, and then watermarked by dynamically converting those HTML parts, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), into an image.

Furthermore, Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a request for the content from a client; obtaining, at a server, the content in text format, automatically by the server*. However, Truong teaches an Internet server receiving an HTML file selection. In response, the Internet server communicates the HTML file in textual format to a requesting client (col.8, lines 38-53). Takashi teaches clients accessing or requesting HTML web pages information from a server (0020, 0005, 0024, 2nd parag.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, and Truong, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files, which are in a textual format (as is well known, and shown by Lemay, page 112, lines 15-36), with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003). In other words parts of the text of the HTML files are extracted, and then watermarked by dynamically converting those HTML parts into an image.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a request for the content from a client; obtaining the content in text format*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the image file, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting watermarked information into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches compressing a watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*watermarking preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Troyansky teaches compressing a watermark using lossy compression algorithms--*compression preference* (0004, lines 6-9).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting or storing a digital watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files with hidden images--*watermarks*--such as image (0003).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as image files with hidden images--*watermarks* (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *an HTML containing a reference to the stored content in the image format for retrieval and inline dynamic assembly by the client*. However, Truong teaches the using a web browser for interpreting HTML tags and displaying images identify by the tags—*dynamically assembling by the client browser of identified images*—(col.6, lines 55-67, col.7, lines 7-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the image file, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of image documents, by inserting watermarked information into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

19. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Pagemill.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 16, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing parts of digital files, such as HTML files (0003).

Art Unit: 2178

Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *the mapping preference relates selectable spatial display coordinates to external document identifiers in order to enable user navigation*. However, Pagemill teaches inserting an active image, which contains more than one URL. The image is divided into areas, setup by coordinates along with their associated URLs. When a user clicks on an area, the browser jumps to the URL—*external document identifier*-- of the respective area (page 139, lines 21-33, and fig. 6.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Troyansky, Takashi, Lemay, Truong, and Pagemill, because Troyansky teaches enforcing digital rights of documents, such as HTML by inserting watermarked image files into the document (002-003). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting data in the HTML document from unauthorized use.

20. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troyansky, in view of Takashi, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Truong, and further in view of Minematsu (Pat.# 6,700,993, 3/2/2004, filed on 9/6/2000).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 19, Troyansky teaches inserting a digital watermark into digital content by replacing or converting parts of digital files, such as HTML files such as image (0003). Troyansky fails to explicitly disclose: *receiving a client system request for verification of the watermarked content*. However, Minematsu teaches a user terminal transmitting first transmission of watermarked information to a detection center, where the information is authenticated. The information is then transmitted to the user terminal, where the authentication result is displayed (col.3, lines 61-col.4, line 67). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2178

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Troyansky, Lemay, and Minematsu, because Minematsu teaches providing a tamper resistant watermarked image for encrypting information (col. 3, lines 57-67). Thus, providing the benefit of protecting the obtained HTML document from unauthorized use.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 10/21/2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants indicate that Troyansky fails to teach "providing to the client a media file corresponding to a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML document, wherein the dynamic assembly image tag references textual content as claimed in claims 1 and 28" (page 9, lines 4-7). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of these claims in light of the newly applied rejection above.

Moreover, The Applicants indicate that "Lemay does not teach or suggest providing to the client a media file corresponding to a dynamic assembly image tag of the HTML document, wherein the dynamic assembly image tag references textual content" (page 9, line 21-page 10, line 2). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of these claims in light of the newly applied rejection above.

Claims 3-8, 29-30 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included rejections above.

Moreover, The Applicants indicate that neither Troyansky, nor Lemay teach or suggest, compressing the media file according to a compression preference stored on the server (page 10,

Art Unit: 2178

lines 13-23). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of these claims in light of the newly applied rejection above.

Claims 2, 9-8, 10-12, 31 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included rejections above.

Claims 16-20, 22-23 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included rejections above.

Claims 17-20, 21-23 are rejected at least based on the rationale stated in the newly included rejections above.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/18/05